

**REMARKS**

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1-5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al. (US 5,489,923) in view of Yamamoto et al. (US 5,742,279). Claims 1, 4, 5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al. in view of Takaha et al. (US 6,021,221).

Independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

“wherein a logical product of a first pixel value in a current field line and a second pixel value in one of an immediately preceding field and an immediately subsequent field is obtained, and wherein the bright point is determined to exist only when both values are on.”

In explaining the above 103 rejections, the Examiner apparently relies on Marshall for teaching all of the elements of each independent claim except for extraction means and only relies either Yamamoto or Takaha for teaching the extraction means. It is respectfully submitted that Marshall as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter, merely “Marshall”) does not disclose the above identified feature of claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 1 as presented herein is patentably distinguished from the applied combination of Marshall and Yamamoto and the applied combination of Marshall and Takaha.

For somewhat similar reasons, it is also believed that amended independent claims 4, 5, and 9 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Marshall and Yamamoto and the applied combination of Marshall and Takaha.


Claims 2 and 3 are dependent from independent claim 1 and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Marshall and Yamamoto.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference or references, there is the bases for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:   
Dennis M. Smid  
Reg. No. 34,930  
(212) 588-0800